

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on November 14, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 5, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 40 have been amended and claims 15, 21, 24, and 41 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to incorporate the features of canceled claims 15, 24, and 41 and to clarify that the zone providing additional space for the user to input new ink strokes has an irregular shape and comprises a buffer of a specified width surrounding each of the new input strokes. Support for these amendments may be found on at least page 37, lines 2-4 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-44 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 8-13, 15, 24-28, and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 31, 32-34, 35, 37-40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Capps et al. (US 5,671,438, hereinafter "Capps"). Claims 2 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps. Claims 4, 6, 22, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps in view of Beernink (US 5,683,439).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 31, 32-34, 35, 37-40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 are rejected as being anticipated by Capps. Claims 21 and 41 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to incorporate the allowable features indicated in claims 15 and 24, respectively. Therefore, these claims are allowable over Capps for at least the reasons indicated for claims 15 and 24 in the Office Action. Thus, amended claims 1 and 19 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Claims 3, 5, 7, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 31, 32-34, 35, and 37-39 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 19, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended claim 40 specifies a computer-implemented method for displaying a drawing guide for a free form document editor wherein the drawing guide includes at least one of an active drawing guide and an inactive drawing guide into which a user inputs ink strokes, the method comprising: in response to transitioning to the drawing guide, distinguishing a display of the drawing guide from any region not occupied by the drawing guide; and in response to detecting ink strokes within the drawing guide, displaying the active drawing guide comprising a bounding rectangle encompassing a drawing area that includes the ink strokes detected; receiving inputs of new ink strokes within the inactive writing guide, wherein the inactive drawing guide comprises a zone around the active writing guide the zone providing additional space for the user to input new ink strokes, and wherein the zone has an irregular shape and comprises a buffer of a specified width surrounding each of the new input strokes.

Capp discusses the free-form entry of text into a pen-based computer system. As words are added onto the screen of the computer system, they are combined with an associated paragraph or a new paragraph is created for the words. Words can be automatically inserted into a paragraph by overlapping an existing word. After a word has been added to an associated paragraph, text is repositioned within the associated paragraph. Words inserted into a line of a

paragraph such that the right-most end of the line extends past a right margin are “reflowed” within the associated paragraph so that the lines do not extend beyond the margins. See Col. 1, line 65 through Col. 2, line 43.

It is respectfully submitted that Capps fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 40. For example, Capps fails to disclose an inactive drawing guide which comprises a zone around the active writing guide the zone providing additional space for the user to input new ink strokes, and wherein the zone has an irregular shape and comprises a buffer of a specified width surrounding each of the new input strokes. In contrast, Capps merely discusses bounding boxes which are invisible, rectilinear boxes sized to enclose objects such as text. See Col. 6, lines 51-61 and Fig. 3a. As discussed above, amended claim 40 specifies a zone having an irregular shape and comprising a buffer of a specified width surrounding each of the new input strokes. Capps fails to disclose an irregularly shaped zone (e.g., Capps discusses a rectilinear box) or a buffer of a specified width. Therefore, claim 40 is allowable over Capps and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn for at least the forgoing reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 20

In the Office Action, claims 2-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Capps. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed. Claims 2 and 20 depend from amended claims 1 and 19 and thus specify at least the same features. As discussed above, amended claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Capps at least because they recite the allowable subject incorporated into these claims from canceled claims 15 and 24. Therefore, claims 2 and 20 are also allowable over Capps for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 6, 22, and 36

Claims 4, 6, 22, and 36 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Capps and Beernink. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed. Claims 4, 6, 22, and 36 depend from amended claims 1 and 19 and thus specify at least the same features. It is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 6, 22, and 36 are allowable over the combination of Capps and Beernink as these claims recite the allowable subject incorporated into the claims 1 and 19 from canceled claims 15 and 24, by virtue of their dependencies on claims 1 and 19. As conceded in the Office Action, the features specified in claims 15 and 24 are not taught in the prior art. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 4, 6, 22, and 36 should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

Date: May 13, 2008



/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299